

REMARKS

Claims 1-74 are pending, of which claims 1, 24, 47, and 61 are independent. By virtue of this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13-20, 22-24, 29, 47, 48, 50, 52, 53, and 55-62 are amended, and claims 75-78 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 47-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 19, 22-25, 29-32, 42, 45-51, 61-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uga et al. (US 6,718,326 B2), hereinafter referred to as Uga, in view of Connery et al. (US 6,570,884 B1), hereinafter referred to as Connery. Claims 3-5, 10-18, 20, 21, 26-28, 33-41, 43, 44, 52-60, and 66-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uga (US 6,718,326 B2) in view of Connery (US 6,570,884 B1) in further view of Kadambi et al. (US 6,850,521 B1), hereinafter referred to as Kadambi.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the Interview of October 29, 2009. Applicant believes that the present Response reflects the substance of that interview. Specifically, Applicant understands that the amendments to independent claims 1, 24, 47, and 61 distinguish over the art of record, because claim 47 now recites, "A computer program embodied on a computer readable storage medium encoding instructions for performing a process of handling data packets in a network device, wherein the computer program is configured to cause execution of the process when the instructions are executed..." Moreover, claim 1 recites:

A method of handling data packets in a network device,
said method comprising:

receiving an incoming data packet;
parsing the incoming data packet to obtain a portion of the incoming data packet, the portion including a packet field;
comparing said portion with rules stored in a rule table of the network device, wherein each rule of said rules specifies a set of actions and includes at least one rule field, the at least one rule field including a rule field value, a mask, and a selection flag, the mask specifying a mask-specified subset of the rule field value,
and wherein the comparing further includes

applying the mask to the packet field to obtain a packet field value, and to the rule field value to obtain a mask-specified rule field value, and

obtaining a comparison result by comparing the packet field value against the mask-specified rule field value;

selecting a match between said portion and a particular rule of said rules, based on the comparison result and the selection flag, including selecting the match for the rule field when either the comparison result is positive and the selection flag is positive, or when the comparison result is negative and the selection flag is negative; and

executing a particular set of actions specified by said particular rule.

Applicant submits that neither Uga nor Connery (nor any art of record), nor any proper combination thereof, discloses or renders obvious at least the above-emphasized portions of claim 1. Independent claims 24, 47, and 61 each recite the same or similar limitations. Therefore, and without stipulating to the validity of any of the previous rejections, or to any of the previous characterizations of the art of record or of Applicant's specification or claims, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 24, 47, and 61, as well as their respective dependent claims, are allowable for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3521.

Respectfully submitted,

Brake Hughes Bellermann LLP

Customer Number 57246
202-470-6452



Date: October 29, 2009

William G. Hughes
Reg. No. 46,112